



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,880	06/03/2004	David M. Richlin	RICHP001US	9853
27949	7590	05/15/2009	EXAMINER	
LAW OFFICE OF JAY R. YABLON 910 NORTHUMBERLAND DRIVE SCHEECTADY, NY 12309-2814				NOLAN, JASON MICHAEL
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/15/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/709,880	RICHLIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JASON NOLAN	1626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/7/2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-150 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 1-150 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is responsive to Applicant's Amendment – After Non-Final Rejection, filed 04/07/2008. Claims 1-150 are pending in the instant application; of which Claim 1 is currently amended. This case has been transferred to Jason Nolan from Examiner Sharon Kennedy. In the previous Office Action, mailed 01/09/2008, Examiner Kennedy concluded: Claims 66-150 are allowed; Claims 9-12, 17-21, & 23-65 would be allowed if rewritten as independent claims; and Claims 1-8, 13-16, & 22 were rejected by Rubin et al. (US 5,059,603). All of Examiner Kennedy's conclusions are redacted herein because there is prior art on record (US 7,273,887) that is more analogous to the instant invention than the '603 patent. The '887 patent was not relied for said conclusions, but has an earlier effective filing date and must be re-evaluated.

Election/Restrictions

The instant claims are drawn to Generic Claims and Species Claims as defined in MPEP 806.04. Claim 1, for instance, describes a topical preparation that contains a vasoconstrictor, a penetration enhancer, and a therapeutic agent; each of which is a generic term for specific embodiments (species). For example, Claim 2 is drawn to phenylephrine, one of many specific vasoconstrictors. Likewise, there are several different therapeutic agents and penetration enhancer. Thus, the generic claim recites a multiplicity of species (embodiments – topical preparations that contain at least one of each ingredient).

For this reason, this application discloses and claims a plurality of patentably distinct inventions far too numerous to list individually. Moreover, these inventions

Art Unit: 1626

contain a plurality of patentably distinct compounds, also far too numerous to list individually. For these reasons provided below, restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121, wherein a Group is a set of patentably distinct inventions of a broad statutory category (e.g. compounds, methods of making, methods of using, etc):

- I. Claims 1-65: drawn to products: topical preparations, classified in multiple subclasses of classes 514 and 424.
- II. Claims 66-150: drawn to methods of using the topical preparations, classified in multiple subclasses of class 514 and 424.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). *In the instant case*, the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product. For example, the specification (p. 1) points out that Lidoderm is useful for the treatment of chronic pain.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Election of Species

As an additional requirement, with the election of one of the above groups, a provisional election of species of a particular topical composition is also required. *In this case, the term “species” means a specific embodiment, a topical composition, that includes the required ingredients as outlined in Claim 1: a vasoconstrictor, a penetration enhancer, and a therapeutic agent.*

Examination will begin with the elected species. As per MPEP 803.02, if the elected species is found to be unpatentable, the provisional election will be given effect and all other claims to species will be withdrawn from consideration. If the elected species is found to be allowable, the search will be expanded by the Examiner to consider additional species and subgenera within the generic formula until:

- I. An art rejection can be made, or

II. The genus claim is found to lack unity of invention, or

III. The claims have been searched in their entirety.

Since the decisions in *In re Weber*, 580 F.2d 455, 198 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1978) and *In re Haas*, 580 F.2d 461, 198 USPQ 334 (CCPA 1978), it is improper for the Office to refuse to examine that which applicants regard as their invention, unless the subject matter in a claim lacks unity of invention. *In re Harnisch*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); and *Ex parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984).

Broadly, unity of invention exists where compounds included within a Markush group (1) share a common utility, and (2) share a substantial structural feature essential to that utility.

Following election, the Markush-type claim will be examined fully with respect to the elected species and further to the extent necessary to determine patentability. If the Markush-type claim is not allowable, the provisional election will be given effect and examination will be limited to the Markush-type claim and claims to the elected species, with claims drawn to species patentably distinct from the elected species held withdrawn from further consideration. . . . On the other hand, should the examiner determine that the elected species is allowable, the examination of the Markush-type claim will be extended. If prior art is then found that anticipates or renders obvious the Markush-type claim with respect to a non-elected species, the Markush-type claims shall be rejected and claims to the nonelected species held withdrawn from further consideration.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may

be traversed (37 CFR § 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR § 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

Should Applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, Applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the Examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of the other invention.

Advisory of a Rejoinder

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

Art Unit: 1626

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. § 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason M. Nolan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4356 and e-mail is Jason.Nolan@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri (9:00 - 5:30PM). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are

Art Unit: 1626

unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph M^cKane can be reached on (571) 272-0699. The USPTO fax number for applications is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, (either Private PAIR or Public PAIR). Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. For questions on Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center at (866) 217-9197.

/Jason M. Nolan/

Examiner, Art Unit 1626

/Rebecca L Anderson/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1626